

The Task Force on Court Facilities 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

South Planning Committees Meeting Report

Thursday, August 3, 2000, 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

The Federal Building Conference Room #6278 880 Front Street San Diego, CA 92101

ΔΤ	TE	NI	FI	F	€.

SOUTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

PRESENT:

Mr. John Clarke Hon. Wayne Peterson Ms. Yvonne Campos Mr. Wylie Aitken Hon. Daniel Kremer

ABSENT:

Mr. Hector De La Torre Mr. Charles Smith

CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:

Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Alton Chow, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall

TASK FORCE STAFF:

Mr. Robert Emerson, Sr. Facilities Planner, AOC Mr. Robert Lloyd, Sr. Facilities Planner, AOC

GUESTS:

Mr. John Van Whervin, Los Angeles Superior Court

Mr. Tom Vissers, San Diego Superior Court Mr. Ming Yim, San Diego Superior Court

Mr. Peter Conlon, Orange County Superior Court Mr. Rick Dostal, Orange County Superior Court

I. OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Clarke welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting shortly after 9:30.

II. MEETING SCHEDULE

The next committee meeting will occur on August 31, 2000 in Santa Barbara as part of the Task Force meeting.

III. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Andy Cupples and Simon Park presented an overview of the current facilities, comparing the state of existing facilities to future needs for the following counties:

<u>Kern County</u> – Mr. Andy Cupples presented the findings and evaluation of the trial court facilities in Kern County along with three development options. The county's superior court currently has 41 FTE judges and commissioners working out of 45 courtrooms. The population growth is expected around Bakersfield and the Central regions of the county. The following are some key issues affecting the development options:

- The courts would like to see the two downtown Bakersfield facilities combined.
- Federal and State prisons impact the caseload at Bakersfield, Mojave, North Kern, Shafter/Wasco.
- The Municipal and Superior courts and recently consolidated.

Development Option 1 – Maximum Reuse: Vacate the Mojave-Main Court Facility and Ridgecrest-Division B Courtroom and renovate and/or expand all other existing facilities.

Total Construction Cost \$71,760,221 Total Project Cost \$89,700,276

Development Option 2 – Partial Consolidation: Vacate the Taft Courts Building and the Lake Isbella Branch in addition to the Mojave-Main Court Facility and Ridgecrest-Division B Courtroom. Provide a new 3-courtroom Family Law Facility in Bakersfield and renovate and/or expand all other existing facilities.

Total Construction Cost \$76,351,167 Total Project Cost \$95,438,959

Development Option 3 – Maximum Consolidation: Vacate the Shafter/Wasco Courts Building in addition to the Taft Courts Building, the Lake Isbella Branch, the Mojave-Main Court Facility and Ridgecrest-Division B Courtroom. Provide a new 4-courtroom Family Law Facility in Bakersfield and renovate and/or expand all other existing facilities.

Total Construction Cost \$78,893,786 Total Project Cost \$98,617,233

<u>Orange County</u> – Mr. Andy Cupples presented the findings and evaluation of the trial court facilities in Orange County along with a single development options. The following are some key issues affecting the development option:

- The largest growth is expected in the south and southeast regions of the county.
- A major renovation is being undertaken at the Central Justice Center in Santa Ana.
- There is a plan to replace the South Justice Center with an eight to ten courtroom facility.

All three development options assumed that 202 courtrooms would be needed to meet the current and future needs.

Development Option 1: Abandon the Central Justice Center Annex and all facilities in the South Justice Center. Displace court-related agencies in all other facilities to meet current shortfall of spaces. Use the modular facilities to be acquired from the Federal Court as an interim facility.

Total Construction Cost \$172,274,542 Total Project Cost \$215,343,178

<u>San Diego County</u> – Mr. Andy Cupples presented the findings and evaluation of the trial court facilities in San Diego County along with two development options. The following are some key issues affecting the development options:

• A higher population growth is expected in the north and south regions of the county.

- The plan to replace the County Courthouse in downtown San Diego is currently on hold.
- The County is developing plans for a new juvenile detention facility in the south county region.
- The courts prefers to close San Marcos Traffic Court for increased operational efficiency.
- Madge Bradley, Family Court and the County Courthouse can be consolidated.
- A county-wide ADA upgrade is underway.

The two development options assumed that 233 courtrooms would be needed to meet the current and future needs.

Development Option 1: Abandon the County Courthouse, Kearny Mesa court facilities, North Regional Center Annex, San Marcos Traffic Court, and all temporary structures. Provide five new facilities with a total of 126 courtrooms (includes a 69-courtroom facility to replace County Courthouse and a 16-courtroom facility to replace Kearny Mesa facilities).

Total Construction Cost \$279,640,521 Total Project Cost \$349,550,651

Development Option 2: Abandon all facilities under Option 1 plus Madge Bradley Court and the Family Court. Provide five new facilities with a total of 144 courtrooms (includes a 79-courtroom facility to replace County Courthouse, Madge-Bradley and Family court).

Total Construction Cost \$288,812,342 Total Project Cost \$372,524,918

End of meeting.